arXiv:1512.07445v1 [math.ST] 23 Dec 2015

SMOOTH ESTIMATION OF A MONOTONE HAZARD AND A MONOTONE DENSITY UNDER RANDOM CENSORING

HENDRIK P. LOPUHAÄ AND ENI MUSTA
DELFT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Abstract. We consider kernel smoothed Grenander-type estimators for a monotone hazard rate and a monotone density in the presence of randomly right censored data. We show that they converge at rate $n^{2/5}$ and that the limit distribution at a fixed point is Gaussian with explicitly given mean and variance. It is well-known that standard kernel smoothing leads to inconsistency problems at the boundary points. It turns out that, also by using a boundary correction, we can only establish uniform consistency on intervals that stay away from the end point of the support (though we can go arbitrarily close to the right boundary).

1. Introduction

Nonparametric estimation under shape constraints is currently a very active research area in statistics. A frequently encountered problem in this field is the estimation of the hazard rate, which, in survival analysis, is defined as the probability that an individual will experience an event within a small time interval given that the subject has survived until the beginning of this interval. In this context, monotonicity constraints arise naturally reflecting the property of aging or becoming more reliable as the survival time increases. Beside this, it might be also of interest to characterize the distribution of the event times in terms of the density assuming that it is monotone.

Popular estimators, such as the nonparametric maximum likelihood estimator (NPMLE) or Grenander type estimators, are typically piecewise constant and converge at rate $n^{1/3}$. However, at the price of additional smoothness assumptions on the hazard or density function, the cube-root-n rate of convergence can be improved. Smooth estimation has received considerable attention in the literature, because it is needed to prove that a bootstrap method works (see for instance, Kosorok (2008); Sen, Banerjee, and Woodroofe (2010)). Moreover, it provides a straightforward estimate of the derivative of the function of interest, which is of help when constructing confidence intervals (see for instance, Nane (2015)). Various approaches can be used to obtain smooth shape constrained estimators. It essentially depends on the methods of both isotonization and smoothing and on the order of operations (see for instance, Mammen (1991) or Groeneboom, Jongbloed, and

Delft Institute of Applied Mathematics, Mekelweg 4, 2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands
E-mail address: H.P.Lopuhaa@tudelft.nl, E.Musta@tudelft.nl.

Key words and phrases. isotonic estimation, hazard rate, smoothing, asymptotics, right censoring, Grenander estimator.

Witte (2010)). Chapter 8 in Groeneboom and Jongbloed (2014) gives an overview of such methods.

In this paper, we focus on kernel smoothed Grenander-type estimator (SG) of the hazard function and the probability density in the presence of randomly right censored data. Huang and Wellner (1995) consider the random censorship model and Grenander estimators of a monotone hazard and density, obtained by taking slopes of the greatest convex minorant (lowest concave majorant) of the Nelson-Aalen or Kaplan-Meier estimator. Consistency and asymptotic distribution are established, together with the asymptotic equivalence with the maximum likelihood estimator. The same model and the L_p-error of this type of estimators was investigated in Durot (2007). However, both these papers do not take in consideration smoothing options. On the other hand, the kernel smoothed Grenander-type estimator of a monotone hazard in the context of the Cox model, which is a generalization of the right censoring that takes into account covariates, was introduced in Nane (2013), but without further development of its asymptotic distribution. However, on the basis of Theorem 3.1 in Groeneboom and Jongbloed (2013), where no censoring takes place, our main result (Theorem 3.2) was conjectured by Nane (2013). Afterwards, Theorem 11.8 in Groeneboom and Jongbloed (2014) states the limit distribution of the smoothed maximum likelihood estimator (SMLE) of a monotone hazard function using a more delicate argument. Hence, it seems quite natural to address the problem of the smoothed Grenander-type estimator. The present paper, aims at giving a rather short and direct proof of its limit distribution, relying on the method developed in Groeneboom and Jongbloed (2013) together with a Kiefer-Wolfowitz type of result derived in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014). Both Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4.4, highlight the fact that also after applying smoothing techniques, the NPMLE and the Grenander estimator remain asymptotically equivalent.

Furthermore, we study inconsistency problems at the boundaries of the support. In order to prevent those, different approaches have been tried, including penalization (see for instance, Groeneboom and Jongbloed (2013)) and boundary corrections (see for instance, Albers (2012)). However, no method performs strictly better than the others. We choose to use boundary kernels, but we discover that still the inconsistency at the right boundary can not be avoided. The main reason for this is that a bound on the distance between the cumulative hazard (cumulative distribution) function and the Nelson-Aalen (Kaplan-Meier) estimator is only available on intervals strictly smaller than the end point of the support.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we briefly introduce the Grenander estimator in the random censorship model and recall some results needed in the sequel. The smoothed estimator of a monotone hazard function is described in Section 3 and it is shown to be asymptotically normally distributed. Moreover, a smooth estimator based on boundary kernels is studied and uniform consistency is derived. Using the same approach, in Section 4 we deal with the problem of estimating a smooth monotone density function. Section 5 is devoted to numerical results on pointwise confidence intervals. Finally, we end with a short discussion on how these results relate to a more general picture.

2. The random censorship model

Suppose we have an i.i.d. sample $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ with distribution function F and density f, representing the survival times. Let $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ be the i.i.d. censoring variables with a distribution function G and density g. Under the random censorship model, we assume that the survival time X and the censoring time C are independent and the observed data consists of i.i.d. pairs of random variables $(T_1, \Delta_1), \ldots, (T_n, \Delta_n)$, where T denotes the follow-up time $T = \min(X, C)$ and $\Delta = \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq C\}}$ is the censoring indicator.

Let H and H^{uc} denote the distribution function of the follow-up time and the sub-distribution function of the uncensored observations, respectively, i.e., $H^{uc}(x) = \mathbb{P}(T \leq x, \Delta = 1)$. Note that $H^{uc}(x)$ and $H(x)$ are differentiable with derivatives

$$h^{uc}(x) = f(x)\,(1 - G(x))$$

and

$$h(x) = f(x)(1 - G(x)) + g(x)(1 - F(x))$$

respectively. We also assume that $\tau_H = \tau_G < \tau_F \leq \infty$, where τ_F, τ_G and τ_H are the end points of the support of F, G and H.

The hazard rate λ is characterized by the following relation

$$\lambda(t) = \frac{f(t)}{1 - F(t)}$$

and we refer to the quantity

$$\Lambda(t) = \int_0^t \lambda(u)\,\mathrm{d}u,$$

as the cumulative hazard function. First, we aim at estimating λ, subject to the constraint that it is increasing (the case of a decreasing hazard is analogous), on the basis of n observations $(T_1, \Delta_1), \ldots, (T_n, \Delta_n)$. The Grenander-type estimator $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ of λ is defined as the left-hand slope of the greatest convex minorant $\tilde{\Lambda}_n$ of the Nelson-Aalen estimator Λ_n of the cumulative hazard function Λ, where

$$\Lambda_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{T_i \leq t\}} \Delta_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_j \geq T_i\}}}.$$

Figure 1 shows the Nelson-Aalen estimator and its greatest convex minorant for a sample of $n = 500$ from a Weibull distribution with shape parameter 3 and scale parameter 1 for the event times and the uniform distribution on $(0, 1.3)$ for the censoring times. We consider only the data up to the last observed time before the 90% quantile of H. The resulting Grenander-type estimator can be seen in Figure 2.

In Huang and Wellner (1995) it is shown that the Grenander estimator of a nondecreasing hazard rate satisfies the following pointwise consistency result

$$\lambda(t-) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \tilde{\lambda}_n(t) \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \tilde{\lambda}_n(t) \leq \lambda(t+), \tag{1}$$



FIGURE 1. The Nelson-Aalen estimator (piecewise constant solid line) of the cumulative hazard (dotted line) and its greatest convex minorant (solid line).

with probability one and for all $0 < t < \tau_H$, where $\lambda(t-)$ and $\lambda(t+)$ denote the left and right limit at t. Moreover, we will also make use of the fact that for any $0 < M < \tau_H$,

$$\sqrt{n} \sup_{u\in[0,M]} \left|\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u) - \Lambda(u)\right| = O_P(1), \tag{2}$$

(see for instance, Lopuhaä and Nane (2013), Theorem 5, in the case $\beta = 0$, or Vaart and Wellner (1996), Example 3.9.19).

It becomes useful to introduce

$$\Phi(x) = \int \mathbb{1}_{[x,\infty)}(y)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(y,\delta) = 1 - H(x) \tag{3}$$

and

$$\Phi_n(x) = \int \mathbb{1}_{[x,\infty)}(y)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(y,\delta), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbb{P}$ is the probability distribution of (T,Δ) and $\mathbb{P}_n$ is the empirical measure of the pairs (T_i,Δ_i), $i = 1,\ldots,n$. From Lemma 4 in Lopuhaä and Nane (2013) we have,

$$\sup_{x\in[0,\tau_H]} |\Phi_n(x) - \Phi(x)| \to 0, \text{ a.s., and } \sqrt{n} \sup_{x\in[0,\tau_H]} |\Phi_n(x) - \Phi(x)| = O_P(1). \tag{5}$$

Let us notice that, with these notations, we can also write

$$\Lambda_n(t) = \int \frac{\delta \mathbb{1}_{\{u\le t\}}}{\Phi_n(u)}\, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta), \qquad \Lambda(t) = \int \frac{\delta \mathbb{1}_{\{u\le t\}}}{\Phi(u)}\, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta). \tag{6}$$

Our second objective is to estimate a monotone (e.g., increasing) density function f . In this case the Grenander-type estimator $\tilde{f}_n$ of f is defined as the left-hand slope of the greatest convex minorant $\tilde{F}_n$ of the Kaplan-Meier estimator F_n of the cumulative distribution function F. Pointwise consistency of the Grenander estimator of a nondecreasing density:

$$f(t-) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \tilde{f}_n(t) \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \tilde{f}_n(t) \leq f(t+), \tag{7}$$

with probability one, for all $0 < t < \tau_H$, where $f(t-)$ and $f(t+)$ denote the left and right limit at t, is proved in Huang and Wellner (1995). Moreover, for any $0 < M < \tau_H$, it holds

$$\sqrt{n} \sup_{u\in[0,M]} \left|\tilde{F}_n(u) - F(u)\right| = O_P(1), \tag{8}$$

(see for instance, Breslow and Crowley (1974), Theorem 5). By Theorem 2 in Major and Rejtő (1988), for each $0 < M < \tau_H$ and $x \geq 0$, we have the following strong approximation

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ \sup_{t\in[0,M]} n\left|F_n(t) - F(t) - n^{-1/2}(1-F(t))W\circ L(t)\right| > x + K_1 \log n \right\} \leq K_2 \mathrm{e}^{-K_3 x}, \tag{9}$$

where K_1, K_2, K_3 are positive constants, W is a Brownian motion and

$$L(t) = \int_0^t \frac{\lambda(u)}{1-H(u)}\,\mathrm{d}u. \tag{10}$$

3. Smoothed Grenander-type estimator of a monotone hazard

Next, we introduce the smoothed Grenander-type estimator $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}$ of an increasing hazard. Kernel smoothing is a rather simple and broadly used method. Let k be a standard kernel, i.e.,

$$k \text{ is a symmetric probability density with support } [-1,1]. \tag{11}$$

We will consider the scaled version

$$k_b(u) = \frac{1}{b}k\left(\frac{u}{b}\right)$$

of the kernel function k, where $b = b_n$ is a bandwidth that depends on the sample size, such that

$$0 < b_n \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad nb_n \to \infty, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{12}$$

From now on we will use the notation b instead of b_n.

For a fixed $x \in [0, \tau_H]$, the smoothed Grenander-type estimator $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) = \int_{(x-b)\vee 0}^{(x+b)\wedge\tau_H} k_b(x-u)\,\tilde{\lambda}_n(u)\,\mathrm{d}u = \int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u). \tag{13}$$

Figure 2 shows the Grenander-type estimator together with the kernel smoothed version for the same sample as in Figure 1. We used the triweight kernel function

$$k(u) = \frac{35}{32}(1-u^2)^3 \mathbb{1}_{\{|u|\leq 1\}}$$



FIGURE 2. The Grenander-type estimator (dashed line) of the hazard rate (dotted line) and the kernel smoothed version (solid line).

and the bandwidth $b = c_{opt}\, n^{-1/5}$, where c_{opt} is the asymptotically MSE-optimal constant (see (16)) calculated in the point $x_0 = 0.5$.

The following result is rather standard when dealing with kernel smoothed isotonic estimators (see for instance, Nane (2013),Chapter 5). For completeness, we provide a rigorous proof.

Theorem 3.1. *Let k be a kernel function satisfying* (11) *and let $\tilde{\lambda}^{SG}$ be the smoothed Grenander-type estimator defined in* (13)*. Suppose that the hazard function λ is nondecreasing and continuous. Then for each $0 < \epsilon < \tau_H$, it holds*

$$\sup_{x\in[\epsilon,\tau_H-\epsilon]} |\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda(x)| \to 0$$

with probability one.

Proof. First, note that for a fixed $x \in (0, \tau_H)$ and sufficiently large n, we have $0 < x - b < x + b < \tau_H$. We start by writing

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda(x) = \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \tilde{\lambda}_n^{s}(x) + \tilde{\lambda}_n^{s}(x) - \lambda(x),$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{s}(x) = \int k_b(x-u)\,\lambda(u)\,\mathrm{d}u$. Then, a change of variable yields

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n^{s}(x) - \lambda(x) = \int_{-1}^{1} k(y)\,\{\lambda(x-by) - \lambda(x)\}\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Using the continuity of λ and applying the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain that, for each $x \in (0, \tau_H)$,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n^s(x) \to \lambda(x), \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{14}$$

On the other hand,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \tilde{\lambda}_n^s(x) = \int_{-1}^{1} k(y) \left\{ \tilde{\lambda}_n(x - by) - \lambda(x - by) \right\} \mathrm{d}y.$$

Choose $\epsilon > 0$. Then by continuity of λ, we can find $\delta > 0$, such that $0 < x - \delta < x + \delta < \tau_H$ and $|\lambda(x + \delta) - \lambda(x - \delta)| < \epsilon$. Then, there exists N such that, for all $n \geq N$ and for all $y \in [-1, 1]$, it holds $|by| < \delta$. Hence, by the monotonicity of the hazard rate, we get

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n(x - \delta) - \lambda(x + \delta) \leq \tilde{\lambda}_n(x - by) - \lambda(x - by) \leq \tilde{\lambda}_n(x + \delta) - \lambda(x - \delta).$$

It follows from (1) and (11) that

$$-\epsilon \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \tilde{\lambda}_n^s(x) \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \tilde{\lambda}_n^s(x) \leq \epsilon,$$

with probability one. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, together with (14), this proves the strong pointwise consistency at each fixed $x \in (0, \tau_H)$. Finally, uniform consistency in $[\epsilon, \tau_H - \epsilon]$ follows from the fact that we have a sequence of monotone functions converging pointwise to a continuous, monotone function on a compact interval. □

It is worth noticing that, if one is willing to assume that λ is twice differentiable with uniformly bounded first and second derivatives, and that k is differentiable with a bounded derivative, then we get a more precise result on the order of convergence

$$\sup_{x \in [\epsilon, \tau_H - \epsilon]} |\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda(x)| = O_P(b^{-1} n^{-1/2} + b^2).$$

Such extra assumptions are considered in Theorem 5.2 in Nane (2013) for the Cox model and the right censoring model is just a particular case with regression parameters $\beta = 0$. Furthermore, in a similar way, it can be proved that also the estimator for the derivative of the hazard is uniformly consistent in $[\epsilon, \tau_H - \epsilon]$, provided that λ is continuously differentiable and the kernel is differentiable with bounded derivative.

The pointwise asymptotic normality of the smoothed Grenander estimator is stated in the next theorem. Its proof is inspired by the approach used in Groeneboom and Jongbloed (2013). The key step consists in using a Kiefer-Wolfowitz type of result for the Nelson-Aalen estimator, which has recently been obtained by Durot and Lopuhaä (2014).

Theorem 3.2. *Let λ be a nondecreasing and twice continuously differentiable hazard such that λ and λ' are strictly positive. Let k satisfy* (11) *and suppose that it is differentiable with a uniformly bounded derivative. If $bn^{1/5} \to c \in (0, \infty)$, then for each $x \in (0, \tau_h)$,*

$$n^{2/5} \big(\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda(x) \big) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mu, \sigma^2),$$

where

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2} c^2 \lambda''(x) \int u^2 k(u) \, \mathrm{d}u \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2 = \frac{\lambda(x)}{c\,(1 - H(x))} \int k^2(u) \, \mathrm{d}u. \tag{15}$$

For a fixed $x \in (0, \tau_h)$, the asymptotically MSE-optimal bandwidth b for $\tilde{\lambda}^{SG}$ is given by $c_{opt}(x)n^{-1/5}$, where

$$c_{opt}(x) = \left\{ \lambda(x) \int k^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}u \right\}^{1/5} \left\{ (1-H(x))\lambda''(x)^2 \left(\int u^2\, k(u)\,\mathrm{d}u \right)^2 \right\}^{-1/5}. \tag{16}$$

Proof. Once again we fix $x \in (0, \tau_H)$. Then, for sufficiently large n, we have $0 < x - b < x + b \leq M < \tau_H$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) = &\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda(u) + \int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\Lambda_n - \Lambda)(u) \\ &+ \int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\tilde{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_n)(u). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The first (deterministic) term on the right hand side of (17) gives us the asymptotic bias by using a change of variables, a Taylor expansion, and the properties of the kernel:

$$\begin{aligned} n^{2/5} \left\{ \int_{x-b}^{x+b} k_b(x-u)\,\lambda(u)\,\mathrm{d}u - \lambda(x) \right\} &= n^{2/5} \int_{-1}^{1} k(y)\,\{\lambda(x-by) - \lambda(x)\}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &= n^{2/5} \int_{-1}^{1} k(y) \left\{ -\lambda'(x)by + \frac{1}{2}\lambda''(\xi_n)b^2y^2 \right\} \mathrm{d}y, \\ &\to \frac{1}{2}\,c^2\,\lambda''(x) \int_{-1}^{1} y^2\,k(y)\,\mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

where $|\xi_n - x| < b|y| \leq b \to 0$. On the other hand, the last term on the right hand side of (17) converges to 0 in probability. Indeed, integration by parts formula enables us to write

$$\begin{aligned} n^{2/5} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\tilde{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_n)(u) &= n^{2/5} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left\{ \tilde{\Lambda}_n(u) - \Lambda_n(u) \right\} \frac{1}{b^2}\,k'\left(\frac{x-u}{b} \right) \mathrm{d}u \\ &= \frac{n^{2/5}}{b} \int_{-1}^{1} \left\{ \tilde{\Lambda}_n(x-by) - \Lambda_n(x-by) \right\} k'(y)\,\mathrm{d}y, \end{aligned}$$

and then we use $\sup_{t\in[0,\tau_H]} |\tilde{\Lambda}_n(t) - \Lambda_n(t)| = O_p(n^{-2/3}(\log n)^{2/3})$ (see Durot and Lopuhaä (2014), Corollary 3.4) together with the boundedness of k'.

What remains is to prove that

$$n^{2/5} \int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\Lambda_n - \Lambda)(u) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2),$$

where σ^2 is defined in (15). Let us start by writing

$$n^{2/5} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\Lambda_n - \Lambda)(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{bn^{1/5}}} \int_{-1}^{1} k(y)\,\mathrm{d}\hat{W}_n(y),$$

where, for each $y \in [-1,1]$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{W}_n(y) &= \sqrt{\frac{n}{b}} \left\{ \Lambda_n(x-by) - \Lambda_n(x) - \Lambda(x-by) + \Lambda(x) \right\} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{n}{b}} \int \frac{\delta}{\Phi_n(u)} \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{[0,x-by]}(u) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(u) \right\} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta) \\
&\quad - \sqrt{\frac{n}{b}} \int \frac{\delta}{\Phi(u)} \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{[0,x-by]}(u) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(u) \right\} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta) \qquad (18) \\
&= b^{-1/2} \int \frac{\delta}{\Phi(u)} \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{[0,x-by]}(u) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(u) \right\} \mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta) \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\frac{n}{b}} \int \delta \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{[0,x-by]}(u) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(u) \right\} \left\{ \frac{1}{\Phi_n(u)} - \frac{1}{\Phi(u)} \right\} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we took advantage of the representations in (6). The last term in the right hand side of (18) is bounded in absolute value by

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{b}} \frac{1}{\Phi_n(M)\,\Phi(M)} \int \delta \left| \mathbb{1}_{[0,x-by]}(u) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(u) \right| |\Phi(u) - \Phi_n(u)| \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta) = o_P(1).$$

Indeed, by using (5), we obtain that $1/\Phi_n(M) = O_P(1)$ and then it suffices to prove that

$$b^{-1/2} \int \delta \left| \mathbb{1}_{[0,x-by]}(u) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(u) \right| \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta) = o_P(1).$$

To do so, we write the left hand side as

$$\begin{aligned}
& b^{-1/2} \int \delta \left| \mathbb{1}_{[0,x-by]}(u) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(u) \right| \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta) \\
& \quad + b^{-1/2} \int \delta \left| \mathbb{1}_{[0,x-by]}(u) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(u) \right| \mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta) \qquad (19) \\
& = b^{-1/2} \left| H^{uc}(x-by) - H^{uc}(x) \right| + O_p(b^{-1/2} n^{-1/2}) = o_P(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that H^{uc} is continuously differentiable and that the class of indicators of intervals forms a VC-class, and is therefore Donsker (see Vaart and Wellner (1996), Theorem 2.6.7 and Theorem 2.5.2).

The last step consists in showing that

$$b^{-1/2} \int \frac{\delta}{\Phi(u)} \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{[0,x-by]}(u) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(u) \right\} \mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta) \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda(x)}{1-H(x)}}\, W(y),$$

where W is a two sided Brownian motion. This follows from Theorem 2.11.23 in Vaart and Wellner (1996). Indeed, we can consider the functions

$$f_{n,y}(u,\delta) = b^{-1/2} \frac{\delta}{\Phi(u)} \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{[0,x-by]}(u) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(u) \right\}, \qquad y \in [-1,1].$$

with envelopes $F_n(u,\delta) = b^{-1/2}\Phi(M)^{-1}\delta \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u)$. It can be easily checked that

$$\|F_n\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{P})} = \frac{1}{b\,\Phi^2(M)} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} f(u)(1-G(u))\,\mathrm{d}u = O(1),$$

and that for all $\eta > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{b\Phi^2(M)} \int_{\left\{u: b^{-1/2}\Phi(M)^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u) > \eta\sqrt{n}\right\}} f(u)(1-G(u))\,\mathrm{d}u \to 0.$$

Moreover, for every sequence $\delta_n \downarrow 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{b\Phi^2(M)} \sup_{|s-t|<\delta_n} \int_{x-b(s\vee t)}^{x-b(s\wedge t)} f(u)(1-G(u))\,\mathrm{d}u \to 0.$$

Since $f_{n,y}$ are sums and products of bounded monotone functions, the bracketing number is bounded (see Vaart and Wellner (1996), Theorem 2.7.5)

$$\log N_{[\,]}\left(\epsilon\|F_n\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})}, \mathcal{F}_n, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})}\right) \lesssim \log\left(1/\epsilon\,\|F_n\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})}\right).$$

Hence, since $\|F_n\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})}$ is bounded we obtain

$$\int_0^{\delta_n} \sqrt{\log N_{[\,]}\left(\epsilon\|F_n\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})}, \mathcal{F}_n, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})}\right)}\,\mathrm{d}\epsilon \lesssim \delta_n + \int_0^{\delta_n} \sqrt{\log(1/\epsilon)}\,\mathrm{d}\epsilon \to 0.$$

Finally, as in (19), for any $s \in [-1,1]$,

$$\mathbb{P}f_{n,s} = b^{-1/2}\left\{H^{uc}(x-bs) - H(x)\right\} \to 0.$$

Furthermore, for $0 \le s \le t$,

$$\mathbb{P}f_{n,s}f_{n,t} = b^{-1}\int_{x-bs}^{x} \frac{f(u)(1-G(u))}{\Phi^2(u)}\,\mathrm{d}u = b^{-1}\int_{x-bs}^{x} \frac{\lambda(u)}{1-H(u)}\,\mathrm{d}u \to \frac{\lambda(x)}{1-H(x)}s.$$

Similarly, for $t \le s \le 0$, $\mathbb{P}f_{n,s}f_{n,t} \to -s\lambda(x)/(1-H(x))$, whereas $\mathbb{P}f_{n,s}f_{n,t} = 0$, for $st < 0$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}f_{n,s}f_{n,t} - \mathbb{P}f_{n,s}\mathbb{P}f_{n,t} \to \begin{cases} \dfrac{\lambda(x)}{1-H(x)}(|s| \wedge |t|) & \text{, if } st \ge 0; \\ 0 & \text{, if } st < 0. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Consequently, according to Theorem 2.11.23 in Vaart and Wellner (1996), the sequence of stochastic processes $\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})f_{n,y}$ converges in distribution to a tight Gaussian process $\mathbb{G}$ with mean zero and covariance given on the right hand side of (20). Note that this is the covariance function of $\sqrt{\lambda(x)/[1-H(x)]}W$, where W is a two sided Brownian motion.

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{2/5} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\Lambda_n - \Lambda)(u) \\ & \quad = \frac{1}{\sqrt{bn^{1/5}}} \int_{-1}^{1} k(y)\,\mathrm{d}\hat{W}_n(y) \\ & \quad \xrightarrow{d} \left(\frac{\lambda(x)}{c(1-H(x))}\right)^{1/2} \int_{-1}^{1} k(y)\,\mathrm{d}W(y) \stackrel{d}{=} N\left(0, \frac{\lambda(x)}{c\,(1-H(x))} \int_{-1}^{1} k^2(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\right). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first part of the theorem.

The optimal c is then obtained by minimizing

$$\mathrm{AMSE}(\tilde{\lambda}^{SG}, c) = \frac{1}{4}\, c^4\, \lambda''(x)^2 \left(\int u^2\, k(u)\,\mathrm{d}u\right)^2 + \frac{\lambda(x)}{c\,(1-H(x))} \int k^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}u$$

with respect to c. □

This result is in line with Theorem 11.8 in Groeneboom and Jongbloed (2014) on the asymptotic distribution of the SMLE under the same model, which highlights the fact that even after applying a smoothing technique the MLE and the Grenander-type estimator remain asymptotically equivalent.

Standard kernel density estimators lead to inconsistency problems at the boundary. In order to prevent those, different methods of boundary corrections can be used. Here we consider boundary kernels and one possibility is to construct linear combinations of $k(u)$ and $uk(u)$ with coefficients depending on the value near the boundary (see Durot, Groeneboom, and Lopuhaä (2013); Zhang and Karunamuni (1998)). To be precise, we define the smoothed Grenander-type estimator $\hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}$ by

$$\hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) = \int_{(x-b)\vee 0}^{(x+b)\wedge\tau_H} k_b^{(x)}(x-u)\,\tilde{\lambda}_n(u)\,\mathrm{d}u = \int_{(x-b)\vee 0}^{(x+b)\wedge\tau_H} k_b^{(x)}(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u), \quad x \in [0, \tau_H], \tag{21}$$

with $k_b^{(x)}(u)$ denoting the rescaled kernel $b^{-1}k^{(x)}(u/b)$ and

$$k_b^{(x)}(u) = \begin{cases} \phi(\frac{x}{b})k(u) + \psi(\frac{x}{b})uk(u) & x \in [0, b], \\ k(u) & x \in (b, \tau_H - b) \\ \phi(\frac{\tau_H - x}{b})k(u) - \psi(\frac{\tau_H - x}{b})uk(u) & x \in [\tau_H - b, \tau_H], \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

where $k(u)$ is a standard kernel satisfying (11). For $s \in [-1, 1]$, the coefficients $\phi(s)$, $\psi(s)$ are determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(s) \int_{-1}^{s} k(u)\,\mathrm{d}u + \psi(s) \int_{-1}^{s} uk(u)\,\mathrm{d}u = 1, \\ \phi(s) \int_{-1}^{s} uk(u)\,\mathrm{d}u + \psi(s) \int_{-1}^{s} u^2 k(u)\,\mathrm{d}u = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Note that ϕ and ψ are not only well defined, but they are also continuously differentiable if the kernel k is assumed to be continuous (see Durot, Groeneboom, and Lopuhaä (2013)).

Furthermore, it can be easily seen that, for each $x \in [0,b]$, equations (23) lead to

$$\int_{-1}^{x/b} k^{(x)}(u)\,\mathrm{d}u = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_{-1}^{x/b} uk^{(x)}(u)\,\mathrm{d}u = 0. \tag{24}$$

In this case, we obtain a stronger uniform consistency result which is stated in the next theorem.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}$ be defined by (21) and suppose that λ is nondecreasing and uniformly continuous. Assume that k satisfies (11) and is differentiable with a uniformly bounded derivative and that $bn^{\alpha} \to c \in (0,\infty)$. If $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, then for any $0 < M < \tau_H$,*

$$\sup_{x\in[0,M]} \left|\hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda(x)\right| \to 0$$

in probability.

Proof. For $x \in [0,M]$, write

$$\hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda(x) = \Big(\hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda_n^s(x)\Big) + \Big(\lambda_n^s(x) - \lambda(x)\Big),$$

where

$$\lambda_n^s(x) = \int_{(x-b)\vee 0}^{(x+b)\wedge\tau_H} k_b^{(x)}(x-u)\,\lambda(u)\,\mathrm{d}u.$$

We have to distinguish between two cases. First, we consider the case $x \in [0,b]$. By means of (24) and the fact that λ is uniformly continuous, a change of variable yields

$$\sup_{x\in[0,b]} |\lambda_n^s(x) - \lambda(x)| \le \sup_{x\in[0,b]} \int_{-1}^{x/b} k^{(x)}(y)\big|\lambda(x-by) - \lambda(x)\big|\,\mathrm{d}y \to 0. \tag{25}$$

On the other hand, integration by parts and a change of variable give

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda_n^s(x) &= \int_0^{x+b} k_b^{(x)}(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}\big(\tilde{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda\big)(u) \\
&= -\int_0^{x+b} \frac{\partial}{\partial u} k_b^{(x)}(x-u)\big(\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u) - \Lambda(u)\big)\,\mathrm{d}u \\
&= \frac{1}{b}\int_{-1}^{x/b} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} k_b^{(x)}(y)\big(\tilde{\Lambda}_n(x-by) - \Lambda(x-by)\big)\,\mathrm{d}y.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Consequently, since for n sufficiently large $x + b \le M$, we obtain

$$\sup_{x\in[0,b]} \left|\hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda_n^s(x)\right| \lesssim \frac{1}{b} \sup_{u\in[0,M]} \left|\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u) - \Lambda(u)\right| = O_p(n^{-1/2+\alpha}),$$

because of (2) and the boundedness of the coefficients ϕ, ψ and of $k(u)$ and $k'(u)$. Together with (25) and since $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, this proves that,

$$\sup_{x\in[0,b]} \left|\hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda(x)\right| = o_P(1).$$



FIGURE 3. The kernel smoothed versions (standard-dashed line and boundary corrected-solid line) of the hazard rate (dotted line).

When $x \in (b, M]$, for sufficiently large n, we have $0 < x - b < x + b < \tau_H$, so that by a change of variable and uniform continuity of λ, it follows that

$$\sup_{x\in(b,M]} |\lambda_n^s(x) - \lambda(x)| \leq \int_{-1}^{1} k(y)|\lambda(x - by) - \lambda(x)| \, \mathrm{d}y \to 0. \tag{27}$$

Furthermore,

$$\hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) = \int_{x-b}^{x+b} k_b(x - u) \, \tilde{\lambda}_n(u) \, \mathrm{d}u,$$

so that, arguing as in (26), we find that

$$\sup_{x\in(b,M]} \left| \hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda_n^s(x) \right| = O_p(n^{-1/2+\alpha}),$$

which, together with (27), proves that

$$\sup_{x\in(b,M]} \left| \hat{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda(x) \right| = o_P(1).$$

This proves the theorem. □

The previous result illustrates that even if we use boundary kernels, we can not avoid inconsistency problems at the end point of the support. Although a bit surprising, this is to be expected because we can only control the distance between the Nelson-Aalen estimator and the cumulative hazard on intervals that stay away from the right boundary (see (2)). Figure 3 illustrates that boundary corrections improve the performance of the smooth estimator constructed with the standard kernel.

4. Smoothed Grenander-type estimator of a monotone density

This section is devoted to the smoothed Grenander-type estimator $\tilde{f}_n^{SG}$ of an increasing density f. Let k be a kernel function satisfying (11). For a fixed $x \in [0, \tau_H]$, $\tilde{f}_n^{SG}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{f}_n^{SG}(x) = \int_{(x-b)\vee 0}^{(x+b)\wedge\tau_H} k_b(x-u)\, \tilde{f}_n(u)\, \mathrm{d}u = \int k_b(x-u)\, \mathrm{d}\tilde{F}_n(u). \tag{28}$$

We also consider the boundary corrected version $\hat{f}_n^{SG}$ of the smoothed Grenander-type estimator, defined by

$$\hat{f}_n^{SG}(x) = \int_{(x-b)\vee 0}^{(x+b)\wedge\tau_H} k_b^{(x)}(x-u)\, \tilde{f}_n(u)\, \mathrm{d}u = \int_{(x-b)\vee 0}^{(x+b)\wedge\tau_H} k_b^{(x)}(x-u)\, \mathrm{d}\tilde{F}_n(u), \quad x \in [0, \tau_H], \tag{29}$$

with $k_b^{(x)}(u)$ as in (22). The following results can be proved in exactly the same way as Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 4.1. *Let k be a kernel function satisfying* (11) *and let $\tilde{f}^{SG}$ be the smoothed Grenander-type estimator defined in* (28)*. Suppose that the density function f is nondecreasing and continuous. Then for each $0 < \epsilon < \tau_H$, it holds*

$$\sup_{x\in[\epsilon,\tau_H-\epsilon]} |\tilde{f}_n^{SG}(x) - f(x)| \to 0$$

with probability one.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\hat{f}_n^{SG}$ be defined by* (21) *and suppose that f is nondecreasing and uniformly continuous. Assume that k satisfies* (11) *and is differentiable with uniformly bounded derivatives and that $b\, n^{\alpha} \to c \in (0, \infty)$. If $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, then for any $0 < M < \tau_H$,*

$$\sup_{x\in[0,M]} \left| \hat{f}_n^{SG}(x) - f(x) \right| \to 0$$

in probability.

Figure 4 shows the smooth isotonic estimators of a decreasing density for a sample of size $n = 500$. We choose an exponential distribution with mean 1 truncated to $[0, 5]$ for the event times and an exponential distribution with mean 2 truncated to $[0, 5]$ for the censoring times. The bandwidth used is $b = c_{opt}\, n^{-1/5}$, where $c_{opt} = 5.14$ is the asymptotically MSE-optimal constant (see (35)) corresponding to $x_0 = 2.5$.

In order to derive the asymptotic normality of the smoothed Grenander-type estimator $\tilde{f}_n^{SG}$ we first provide a Kiefer-Wolfowitz type of result for the Kaplan-Meier estimator.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $0 < M < \tau_H$. Let f be a nondecreasing and continuously differentiable density such that f and f' are strictly positive. Then we have*

$$\sup_{x\in[0,M]} |\tilde{F}_n(x) - F_n(x)| = O_P\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{2/3},$$

where F_n is the Kaplan-Meier estimator and $\tilde{F}_n$ is the greatest convex minorant of F_n.



FIGURE 4. The kernel smoothed versions (standard-dashed line and boundary corrected-solid line) of the density function (dotted line).

Proof. We consider f on the interval $[0, M]$ and apply Theorem 2.2 in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014). The density f satisfies condition (A1) of this theorem with $[a, b] = [0, M]$. Condition (2) of Theorem 2.2 in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014) is provided by the strong approximation (9), with L defined in (10), $\gamma_n = O(n^{-1} \log n)^{2/3}$, and

$$B(t) = \big(1 - F(L^{-1}(t))\big)\, W(t), \quad t \in [L(0), L(M)]$$

where W is a Brownian motion. It remains to show that B satisfies conditions (A2)-(A3) of Theorem 2.2 in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014) with $\tau = 1$. In order to check these conditions for the process B, let $x \in [L(0), L(M)] = [0, L(M)]$, $u \in (0, 1]$ and $v > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|x-y|\le u} |B(x) - B(y)| > v\right) \\
&\le \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|x-y|\le u,\, y\in[0,L(M)]} |B(x) - B(y)| > v\right) \\
&\le 2\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|x-y|\le u} |W(x) - W(y)| > \frac{v}{3}\right) \\
&\qquad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|x-y|\le u,\, y\in[0,L(M)]} |F(L^{-1}(x)) - F(L^{-1}(y))|\, |W(x)| > \frac{v}{3}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Note that from the proof of Corollary 3.1 in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014) it follows that W satisfies condition (A2) in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014). This means that there exist $K_1, K_2 > 0$, such that the first probability on the right hand side of (30) is bounded by

$K_1 \exp(-K_2 v^2 u^{-1})$. Furthermore, since $u \in (0,1]$ and

$$|F(L^{-1}(x)) - F(L^{-1}(y))| \leq \frac{\sup_{u\in[0,M]} f(u)}{\inf_{u\in[0,M]} L'(u)} |x-y| \leq \frac{\sup_{u\in[0,M]} f(u)}{\inf_{u\in[0,M]} \lambda(u)} |x-y|,$$

the second probability on the right hand side of (30) is bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|W(x)| > \frac{v}{K_3\sqrt{u}}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,L(M)]} |W(t)| > \frac{v}{K_3\sqrt{u}}\right),$$

for some $K_3 > 0$. Hence, by the maximal inequality for Brownian motion, we conclude that there exist $K_1', K_2' > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|x-y|\leq u} |B(x) - B(y)| > v\right) \leq K_1' \exp\left(-K_2' v^2 u^{-1}\right)$$

which proves condition (A2) in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014).

Let us now consider (A3). For all $x \in [0, L(M)]$, $u \in (0,1]$, and $v > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u\leq z\leq x} \left\{B(x-z) - B(x) - vz^2\right\} > 0\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u\leq z\leq x} \left\{W(x-z) - W(x) - \frac{vz^2}{3}\right\} > 0\right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u\leq z\leq x} \left\{F(L^{-1}(x-z))[W(x) - W(x-z)] - \frac{vz^2}{3}\right\} > 0\right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u\leq z\leq x} \left\{\left(F(L^{-1}(x)) - F(L^{-1}(x-z))\right) W(x) - \frac{vz^2}{3}\right\} > 0\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Again, from the proof of Corollary 3.1 in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014) it follows that W satisfies condition (A3) in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014), which means that there exist $K_1, K_2 > 0$, such that the first probability on the right hand side of (31) is bounded by $K_1 \exp(-K_2 v^2 u^3)$. We establish the same bound for the remaining tow probabilities. By the time reversal of the Brownian motion, the process $W'(z) = W(x) - W(x-z)$ is also a Brownian motion on the interval $[u, x]$. Then, using the change of variable $u/z = t$ and the fact that $\widetilde{W}(t) = tu^{-1/2} W'(u/t)$, for $t > 0$, is again a Brownian motion, the second probability on the right hand side of (31) is bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in(0,1]} \frac{t}{\sqrt{u}} \left|W'\left(\frac{u}{t}\right)\right| > \frac{vu^{3/2}}{3t}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{W}(t)| > \frac{vu^{3/2}}{3}\right). \tag{32}$$

Finally,

$$\sup_{u\leq z\leq x} \left|\frac{F(L^{-1}(x)) - F(L^{-1}(x-z))}{z}\right| \leq \frac{\sup_{u\in[0,M]} f(u)}{\inf_{u\in[0,M]} \lambda(u)},$$

so that the third probability on the right hand side of (31) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u\le z\le x}\left|\frac{F(L^{-1}(x))-F(L^{-1}(x-z))}{z}\right||W(x)|>\frac{vu}{3}\right)\\ \le \mathbb{P}\left(|W(x)|>\frac{vu^{3/2}}{K_3}\right)\le \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,L(M)]}|W(t)|>\frac{vu^{3/2}}{K_3}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

for some $K_3>0$. By applying the maximal inequality for Brownian motion to the right hand sides of (32) and (33), we conclude that there exist $K_1', K_2'>0$, such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u\le z\le x}\{B(x-z)-B(x)-vz^2\}>0\right)\le K_1'\exp(-K_2'v^2u^3),$$

which proves condition (A3) in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014). □

Theorem 4.4. *Let f be a nondecreasing and twice continuously differentiable density such that f and f' are strictly positive. Let k satisfy (11) and suppose that it is differentiable with a uniformly bounded derivative. If $bn^{1/5}\to c\in(0,\infty)$, then for each $x\in(0,\tau_h)$, it holds*

$$n^{2/5}\left(\tilde f_n^{SG}(x)-f(x)\right)\xrightarrow{d}N(\mu,\sigma^2),$$

where

$$\mu=\frac{1}{2}c^2f''(x)\int u^2k(u)\,\mathrm{d}u \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2=\frac{f(x)}{c(1-G(x))}\int k^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}u. \tag{34}$$

For a fixed $x\in(0,\tau_h)$, the asymptotically MSE-optimal bandwidth b for $\tilde\lambda^{SG}$ is given by $c_{opt}(x)n^{-1/5}$, where

$$c_{opt}=\left\{f(x)\int k^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}u\right\}^{1/5}\left\{(1-G(x))f''(x)^2\left(\int u^2k(u)\,\mathrm{d}u\right)^2\right\}^{-1/5}. \tag{35}$$

Proof. Fix $x\in(0,\tau_H)$. Then, for sufficiently large n, we have $0<x-b<x+b\le M<\tau_H$. Following the proof of 3.2, we write

$$\tilde f_n^{SG}(x)=\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}F(u)+\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(F_n-F)(u)+\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\tilde F_n-F_n)(u). \tag{36}$$

Again the first (deterministic) term on the right hand side of (36) gives us the asymptotic bias:

$$n^{2/5}\left\{\int_{x-b}^{x+b}k_b(x-u)f(u)\,\mathrm{d}u-f(x)\right\}\to\frac{1}{2}c^2f''(x)\int_{-1}^{1}y^2k(y)\,\mathrm{d}y,$$

and by the Kiefer-Wolfowitz type of result in Lemma 4.3, the last term on the right hand side of (36) converges to 0 in probability. What remains is to prove that

$$n^{2/5}\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(F_n-F)(u)\xrightarrow{d}N(0,\sigma^2),$$

where σ^2 is defined in (34). We write

$$n^{2/5}\int_{x-b}^{x+b} k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(F_n-F)(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{b\,n^{1/5}}}\int_{-1}^{1} k(y)\,\mathrm{d}\hat{W}_n(y),$$

where, for each $y\in[-1,1]$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{W}_n(y) &= \sqrt{\frac{n}{b}}\Big\{F_n(x-by)-F_n(x)-F(x-by)+F(x)\Big\}\\
&= \sqrt{\frac{n}{b}}\Big\{F_n(x-by)-F(x-by)-n^{-1/2}(1-F(x-by))W\circ L(x-by)\Big\}\\
&\quad -\sqrt{\frac{n}{b}}\left\{F_n(x)-F(x)-n^{-1/2}(1-F(x))W\circ L(x)\right\}\\
&\quad +\frac{1}{\sqrt{b}}\Big(1-F(x)\Big)\Big\{W\circ L(x-by)-W\circ L(x)\Big\}\\
&\quad +\frac{1}{\sqrt{b}}\Big(F(x)-F(x-by)\Big)W\circ L(x-by).
\end{aligned}\tag{37}$$

Using the strong approximation (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u\in[0,M]}\sqrt{\frac{n}{b}}\left|F_n(u)-F(u)-n^{-1/2}(1-F(u))W\circ L(u)\right|>\epsilon\right)\\
&\qquad\le K_1\exp\Big\{-K_2(\epsilon\sqrt{nb}-K_3\log n)\Big\}\to 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and it then follows that the first two terms on the right hand side of (37) converge to 0 in probability uniformly in y. For the last term, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{y\in[-1,1]}\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{b}}\Big(F(x)-F(x-by)\Big)W\circ L(x-by)\right|>\epsilon\right)\\
&\qquad\le \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{b}\sup_{u\in[0,M]}f(u)\sup_{u\in[0,\|L\|_\infty]}|W(u)|>\epsilon\right)\le K_1\exp\left(-\frac{K_2\epsilon^2}{b}\right)\to 0.
\end{aligned}$$

For the third term on the right hand side of (37), note that $y\mapsto b^{-1/2}(W\circ L(x-by)-W\circ L(x))$, for $y\in[-1,1]$, has the same distribution as the process

$$y\mapsto \widetilde{W}\left(\frac{L(x)-L(x-by)}{b}\right),\quad \text{for } y\in[-1,1],\tag{38}$$

where $\widetilde{W}$ is a two-sided Brownian motion. By uniform continuity of the two-sided Brownian motion on compact intervals, the sequence of stochastic processes in (38) converges to the process $\{\widetilde{W}\left(L'(x)y\right): y\in[-1,1]\}$:

$$\sup_{y\in[-1,1]}\left|\widetilde{W}\left(\frac{L(x)-L(x-by)}{b}\right)-\widetilde{W}\left(L'(x)y\right)\right|\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}0.$$

As a result

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{bn^{1/5}}}\int_{-1}^{1} k(y)\,\mathrm{d}\hat{W}_n(y) \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{\frac{f(x)}{c(1-G(x))}}\int_{-1}^{1} k(y)\,\mathrm{d}\widetilde{W}(y)$$
$$\sim N\left(0, \frac{f(x)}{c(1-G(x))}\int_{-1}^{1} k^2(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\right).$$

The optimal c is then obtained by minimizing

$$\mathrm{AMSE}(\tilde{f}^{SG}, c) = \frac{1}{4}c^4 f''(x)^2\left(\int u^2\,k(u)\,\mathrm{d}u\right)^2 + \frac{f(x)}{c(1-G(x))}\int k^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}u,$$

with respect to c. □

5. Pointwise confidence intervals

In this section we construct pointwise confidence intervals for the hazard rate and the density based on the asymptotic distributions derived in Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4.4 and compare them to confidence intervals constructed using Grenander-type estimators without smoothing. According to Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 in Huang and Wellner (1995), for a fixed $x_0 \in (0, \tau_H)$,

$$n^{1/3}\left|\frac{1-G(x_0)}{4f(x_0)f'(x_0)}\right|^{1/3}\left(\tilde{f}_n(x_0) - f(x_0)\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbb{Z},$$

and

$$n^{1/3}\left|\frac{1-H(x_0)}{4\lambda(x_0)\lambda'(x_0)}\right|^{1/3}\left(\tilde{\lambda}_n(x_0) - \lambda(x_0)\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbb{Z},$$

where W is a two-sided Brownian motion starting from zero and $\mathbb{Z} = \mathrm{argmin}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\{W(t) + t^2\}$. This yields $100(1-\alpha)\%$-confidence intervals for $f(x_0)$ and $\lambda(x_0)$ of the following form

$$C^1_{n,\alpha} = \tilde{f}_n(x_0) \pm n^{-1/3}\hat{c}_{n,1}(x_0)q(\mathbb{Z}, 1-\alpha/2),$$

and

$$C^2_{n,\alpha} = \tilde{\lambda}_n(x_0) \pm n^{-1/3}\hat{c}_{n,2}(x_0)q(\mathbb{Z}, 1-\alpha/2),$$

where $q(\mathbb{Z}, 1-\alpha/2)$ is the $(1-\alpha/2)$ quantile of the distribution $\mathbb{Z}$ and

$$\hat{c}_{n,1}(x_0) = \left|\frac{4\tilde{f}_n(x_0)\tilde{f}'_n(x_0)}{1-G_n(x_0)}\right|^{1/3}, \qquad \hat{c}_{n,2}(x_0) = \left|\frac{4\tilde{\lambda}_n(x_0)\tilde{\lambda}'_n(x_0)}{1-H_n(x_0)}\right|^{1/3}.$$

Here, H_n is the empirical distribution function of T and in order to avoid the denominator taking the value zero, instead of the natural estimator of G, we consider a slightly different

version as in Marron and Padgett (1987):

$$G_n(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \le t < T_{(1)}, \\ 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(\frac{n-i+1}{n-i+2} \right)^{1-\Delta_i} & \text{if } T_{(k-1)} \le t < T_{(k)}, \quad k = 2, \ldots, n, \\ 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{n-i+1}{n-i+2} \right)^{1-\Delta_i} & \text{if } t \ge T_{(n)}. \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

Furthermore, as an estimate for $\tilde{f}_n'(x_0)$ we choose $(\tilde{f}_n(\tau_m) - \tilde{f}_n(\tau_{m-1}))/(\tau_m - \tau_{m-1})$, where τ_{m-1} and τ_m are two succeeding points of jump of $\tilde{f}_n$ such that $x_0 \in (\tau_{m-1}, \tau_m]$, and $\tilde{\lambda}_n'(x_0)$ is estimated similarly. The quantiles of the distribution $\mathbb{Z}$ have been computed in Groeneboom and Wellner (2001) and we will use $q(\mathbb{Z}, 0.975) = 0.998181$.

The pointwise confidence intervals based on the smoothed Grenander-type estimators are constructed from Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4.4. We find

$$\widetilde{C}_{n,\alpha}^1 = \tilde{f}_n^{SG}(x_0) \pm n^{-2/5} \left(\hat{\sigma}_{n,1}(x_0) q_{1-\alpha/2} + \hat{\mu}_{n,1}(x_0) \right),$$

and

$$\widetilde{C}_{n,\alpha}^2 = \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x_0) \pm n^{-2/5} (\hat{\sigma}_{n,2}(x_0) q_{1-\alpha/2} + \hat{\mu}_{n,2}(x_0)),$$

where $q_{1-\alpha/2}$ is the $(1-\alpha/2)$ quantile of the standard normal distribution. The estimators $\hat{\sigma}_{n,1}(x_0)$ and $\hat{\mu}_{n,1}(x_0)$ are obtained by plugging $\tilde{f}_n^{SG}$ and its second derivative for f and f'', respectively, and G_n and $c_{opt}(x_0)$ for G and c, respectively, in (34), and similarly $\hat{\sigma}_{n,2}(x_0)$ and $\hat{\mu}_{n,2}(x_0)$ are obtained from (15). Estimating the bias seems to be a hard problem because it depends on the second derivative of the function of interest. As discussed, for example in Hall (1992), one can estimate the bias by using a bandwidth of a different order for estimating the second derivative or one can use undersmoothing (in that case the bias is zero and we do not need to estimate the second derivative). We tried both methods and it seems that undersmoothing performs better, which is in line with other results available in the literature (see for instance, Hall (1992); Groeneboom and Jongbloed (2015); Cheng, Hall, and Tu (2006)).

When estimating the hazard rate, we choose a Weibull distribution with shape parameter 3 and scale parameter 1 for the event times and the uniform distribution on $(0, 1.3)$ for the censoring times. Confidence intervals are calculated at the point $x_0 = 0.5$ using 1000 sets of data and the bandwidth in the case of undersmoothing is $b = c_{opt}(x_0) n^{-1/4}$, where $c_{opt}(x_0) = 1.2$. In the case of bias estimation we use $b = c_{opt}(x_0) n^{-5/17}$ to estimate the hazard and $b_1 = c_{opt}(x_0) n^{-1/17}$ to estimate its second derivative (as suggested in Hall (1992)).

Table 1 shows the performance, for various sample sizes, of the confidence intervals based on the asymptotic distribution (AD) of the Grenander-type estimator and of the smoothed Grenander estimator (for both undersmoothing and bias estimation). The poor performance of the Grenander-type estimator seems to be related to the crude estimate of the derivative of the hazard with the slope of the correspondent segment. On the other

	Grenander		SG-undersmoothing		SG-bias estimation	
n	AL	CP	AL	CP	AL	CP
100	0.930	0.840	0.648	0.912	0.689	0.955
500	0.560	0.848	0.366	0.948	0.383	0.975
1000	0.447	0.847	0.283	0.954	0.295	0.977
5000	0.255	0.841	0.155	0.953	0.157	0.978

TABLE 1. The average length (AL) and the coverage probabilities (CP) for 95% pointwise confidence intervals of the hazard rate at the point $x_0 = 0.5$ based on the asymptotic distribution.



(A) (B)

FIGURE 5. Left panel: Actual coverage of confidence intervals with nominal coverage 95% for the hazard rate based on the asymptotic distribution. Dashed line-nominal level; dotdashed line-Grenander-type; solid line-SG undersmoothing; dotted line-SG bias estimation. Right panel: 95% confidence intervals based on the asymptotic distribution for the hazard rate using undersmoothing.

hand, it is obvious that smoothing leads to significantly better results in terms of both average length and coverage probabilities. As expected, when using undersmoothing, as the sample size increases we get shorter confidence intervals and coverage probabilities that are closer to the nominal level of 95%. By estimating the bias, we obtain coverage probabilities that are higher than 95%, because the confidence intervals are bigger compared to the average length when using undersmoothing. Another way to compare the performance of the different methods is to take a fixed sample size $n = 500$ and different points of the support of the hazard function. Figure 5 shows that confidence intervals based on undersmoothing behave well also at the boundaries in terms of coverage probabilities,

	Grenander		SG-undersmoothing		SG-bias estimation	
n	AL	CP	AL	CP	AL	CP
100	0.364	0.867	0.23	0.999	0.24	0.997
500	0.210	0.870	0.126	0.980	0.134	0.992
1000	0.160	0.865	0.096	0.974	0.105	0.985
5000	0.090	0.845	0.052	0.962	0.056	0.976
10000	0.070	0.855	0.040	0.959	0.041	0.970

TABLE 2. The average length (AL) and the coverage probabilities (CP) for 95% pointwise confidence intervals of the density function at the point $x_0 = 1$ based on the asymptotic distribution.

but the length increases as we move to the left end point of the support. In order to maintain good visibility of the performance of the smooth estimators, we left out the poor performance of the Grenander estimator at point $x = 0.1$.

Finally, we consider estimation of the density. We simulate the event times and the censoring times from exponential distributions with means 1 and 2, truncated to the interval $[0, 5]$. Confidence intervals are calculated at the point $x_0 = 1$ using 1000 sets of data and the bandwidth in the case of undersmoothing is $b = c_{opt}(2.5)n^{-1/4}$, where $c_{opt}(2.5) = 5.14$. When estimating the bias we use $b = c_{opt}(2.5)n^{-5/17}$ to estimate the hazard and $b_1 = c_{opt}(2.5)n^{-1/17}$ to estimate its second derivative (as suggested in Hall (1992)). Table 2 shows the performance, for various sample sizes, of the confidence intervals based on the asymptotic distribution (AD) of the Grenander-type estimator and of the smoothed Grenander estimator (for both undersmoothing and bias estimation). Again, confidence intervals based on the Grenander-type estimator have a poor coverage. On the other hand, by considering the smoothed version, we usually obtain very high coverage probabilities which tend to get closer to the nominal level as the sample size increases. Again, undersmoothing behaves slightly better. The performance of these three methods for a fixed sample size $n = 500$ and different points of the support of the density is illustrated in Figure 6.

6. Discussion

In the present paper, we have considered kernel smoothed Grenander estimators for a monotone hazard and a monotone density under right censoring. We have established uniform strong convergence of the estimators in the interior of the support of distribution of the follow-up times and asymptotic normality at a rate of convergence of $n^{2/5}$. The behavior of the estimators has been illustrated in a small simulation study, where it can be seen that the smoothed versions perform better than the ordinary Grenander estimators. The proof of asymptotic normality is more or less straightforward thanks to a Kiefer-Wolfowitz type of result provided in Durot and Lopuhaä (2014).



(A) (B)

FIGURE 6. Left panel: Actual coverage of confidence intervals with nominal coverage 95% for the density function based on the asymptotic distribution. Dashed line-nominal level; dotdashed line-Grenander-type; solid line-SG undersmoothing; dotted line-SG bias estimation. Right panel: 95% confidence intervals based on the asymptotic distribution for the density function using undersmoothing.

The right censoring model is a special case of the Cox regression model, where in addition one can consider various covariates. A natural question then is whether the previous approach for proving the asymptotic normality of a smoothed Grenander-type estimator, for example, for the hazard rate can be extended to such a more general setting. Unfortunately, no Kiefer-Wolfowitz nor an embedding into the Brownian motion is available for the Breslow estimator, being the natural naive estimator for the cumulative hazard. Recently, Groeneboom and Jongbloed (2014) developed different approach to establish asymptotic normality of smoothed isotonic estimators, which is mainly based on uniform L_2-bounds for the distance between the non-smoothed estimator and the true function. This approach seems to have more potential for generalizing our results to the Cox model. However, things will not go smoothly, because the presence of covariates makes it more difficult to obtain bounds on the tail probabilities for the inverse process involved and in the Cox model one has to deal with a rather complicated martingale associated with the Breslow estimator. This is beyond the scope of this paper, but will be the topic of future research.

REFERENCES

Albers, M. G. (2012). Boundary Estimation of Densities with Bounded Support. Master's thesis. ETH Zürich.

Breslow, N. and J. Crowley (1974). A large sample study of the life table and product limit estimates under random censorship. *The Annals of Statistics* 2, 437–453.

Cheng, M. Y., P. Hall, and D. Tu (2006). Confidence bands for hazard rates under random censorship. *Biometrika* 93.2, 357–366.

Durot, C. (2007). On the $\mathbb{L}_p$-error of monotonicity constrained estimators. *The Annals of Statistics* 35.3, 1080–1104.

Durot, C., P. Groeneboom, and H. P. Lopuhaä (2013). Testing equality of functions under monotonicity constraints. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* 25.4, 939–970.

Durot, C. and H. P. Lopuhaä (2014). A Kiefer-Wolfowitz type of result in a general setting, with an application to smooth monotone estimation. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 8.2, 2479–2513.

Groeneboom, P. and G. Jongbloed (2013). Smooth and non-smooth estimates of a monotone hazard. In: *From probability to statistics and back: high-dimensional models and processes*. Vol. 9. Inst. Math. Statist., Beachwood, OH, pp. 174–196.

Groeneboom, P. and G. Jongbloed (2014). Nonparametric estimation under shape constraints. Vol. 38. Cambridge University Press.

Groeneboom, P. and G. Jongbloed (2015). Nonparametric confidence intervals for monotone functions. *The Annals of Statistics* 43.5, 2019–2054.

Groeneboom, P., G. Jongbloed, and B. I. Witte (2010). Maximum smoothed likelihood estimation and smoothed maximum likelihood estimation in the current status model. *The Annals of Statistics* 38.1, 352–387.

Groeneboom, P. and J. A. Wellner (2001). Computing Chernoff's distribution. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 10.2, 388–400.

Hall, P. (1992). Effect of bias estimation on coverage accuracy of bootstrap confidence intervals for a probability density. *The Annals of Statistics* 20.2, 675–694.

Huang, J. and J. A. Wellner (1995). Estimation of a monotone density or monotone hazard under random censoring. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics. Theory and Applications* 22.1, 3–33.

Kosorok, M. R. (2008). Bootstrapping the Grenander estimator. In: *Beyond parametrics in interdisciplinary research: Festschrift in honor of Professor Pranab K. Sen*. Vol. 1. Beachwood, OH: Inst. Math. Statist., pp. 282–292.

Lopuhaä, H. P. and G. F. Nane (2013). Shape constrained non-parametric estimators of the baseline distribution in Cox proportional hazards model. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics. Theory and Applications* 40.3, 619–646.

Major, P. and L. Rejtő (1988). Strong embedding of the estimator of the distribution function under random censorship. *The Annals of Statistics* 16.3, 1113–1132.

Mammen, E. (1991). Estimating a smooth monotone regression function. *The Annals of Statistics* 19.2, 724–740.

Marron, J. S. and W. J. Padgett (1987). Asymptotically optimal bandwidth selection for kernel density estimators from randomly right-censored samples. *The Annals of Statistics* 15.4, 1520–1535.

Nane, G. F (2013). Shape Constrained Nonparametric Estimation in the Cox Model. Ph.D. thesis.

Nane, G. F (2015). A likelihood ratio test for monotone baseline hazard functions in the Cox model. *Statistica Sinica* 25, 1163–1184.

Sen, B., M. Banerjee, and M. Woodroofe (2010). Inconsistency of bootstrap: the Grenander estimator. *The Annals of Statistics* 38.4, 1953–1977.

Vaart, A. W. van der and J. A. Wellner (1996). Weak convergence and empirical processes. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Zhang, S. and R. J. Karunamuni (1998). On kernel density estimation near endpoints. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 70.2, 301–316.